IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF
ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.S.R. VARMA
And
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.SWAROOP REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO. 14922 OF 2006

Dated: 21st August, 2006

Between:

A.Suhasini D/o A.Rami Reddy

Petitioner

AND

The Superintendent of Police,
Kadapa District, Kadapa and others

Respondents

ORAL ORDER:
(Per the Hon'ble Sri Justice D.S.R. Varma)

Heard the learned Government Pleader for Home, appearing on behalf of the learned Advocate General.

2. This writ petition is registered by this Court on a complaint, dated 14.7.2006, sent by the petitioner Miss A.Suhasini, daughter of Mr. A.Rami Reddy, D.No.26/840-3, Bangaraiah Kottala Street, Proddatur, Kadapa District,

complaining that she was a minor and was kidnapped by one Mr. Ankalgari Ravi, Home Guard, and his parents by name Bharathi and Ramudu, Mr.Ankalgari Ramaiah and his son Ramachanraiah, Palakrishna and another, for the purpose of marriage, on 6.6.2006. It is further averred that the police did not act properly on the basis of her complaint.

3. In response to the notices issued by this Court, the 5th respondent – Inspector of Police, Mydukur Police Station, Kadapa District, filed counter-affidavit stating *inter alia* that the mother of the petitioner sent a fax message, dated 12.6.2006, to this Court, complaining that her daughter, who was a minor, was kidnapped by one Ankalgari Ravi, Home Guard, and his parents and the police are not taking any action. The said fax message was treated as Writ Petition No.12305 of 2006. It is further stated that the father of the petitioner also lodged a complaint with Mydukur Police stating that on 6.6.2006 his daughter i.e. the petitioner herein was kidnapped by one Ankalgari Ravi and his friends. Basing on these complaints, a case in Cr.No.97 of 2006 was registered by Mydukur police, for the offence punishable under Section 366-A read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code. While the investigation was in progress in Cr.No.97 of 2006, the petitioner had voluntarily approached Mydukur police station on 23.6.2006 at about 12.30 p.m. and gave statement in her own handwriting to the effect that she

voluntarily left to her friend's house at Chintalacheruvu village, Chagalamarri Mandal, Kurnool District. She further stated that she had fallen in love with one Ravi and apprehending danger to her life from her parents, she resorted to go away from her house. It is further stated that the police have handed over the petitioner to her parents on 25.6.2006.

4. Having regard to the revelations made in the counter-affidavit filed in W.P.No.12305 of 2006, it was closed by this Court on 29.6.2006.

5. Subsequently, again the petitioner herself sent the letter, dated 14.7.2006, alleging the same kidnapping against the same persons. In other words, the said complaint is almost replica of the earlier complaint made by her mother.

6. Upon direction, the girl was produced before this Court and upon questioning by us, she states that at the instance of her brother-in-law – Mr. Malleshwar Reddy, who was a reporter in a vernacular newspaper, she made the complaint. She again states that the said Malleshwar Reddy had written the complaint to her dictation. The said Malleshwar Reddy, who is also present before this Court, denies the same. These conflicting statements made by the petitioner, all the above events and the statements and counter statements made by the petitioner and others, in our considered view, are nothing short of abuse of process of Court. Courts shall not be utilized as a

platform by any person for achieving his/her end and the desired result, which cannot be achieved by any other means permitted by law. In other words, a responsible citizen is expected to seek redressal of the grievance, if any, in accordance with law. Dubious methods should always be discouraged.

7. In the present case, we place on record our displeasure and anguish about the conduct of the petitioner and other persons, stated to be the close relatives of the petitioner, by name Malleshwar Reddy.

8. However, having regard to the age and other aspects, we do consider it as a case, which deserves a lenient view.

9. Accordingly, keeping in view the totality of the circumstances and hoping the petitioner and other persons to be more responsible henceforth, while dealing with and approaching the Courts, the writ petition is closed. No order as to costs.

D.S.R.Varma, J.

P.Swaroop Reddy, J.

21st August, 2006
MAS.